



**University of Florida Comprehensive Master Plan, 2005-2015  
Master Plan Steering Committee  
January 27, 2004  
Facilities Planning and Construction Conference 226 Stadium  
**DRAFT -- MINUTES****

**Members Present:**

Ms. Linda Dixon, Manager, Planning Office, Facilities Planning & Construction  
Jane Brockmann, Zoology  
Mike Brodeur, Pharmacy  
Jerry Cutler, Art & Art History  
Bruce Delaney, UF Foundations  
Tom Emmel, Florida Museum of Natural History  
Tina Gurucharri, Landscape Architecture  
Marc Hoit, Academic Affairs  
Marjorie Hoy, Entomology & Nematology  
Jean Larson, Mathematic Joe Little, College of Law  
Joe Little, College of Law  
Jim Morgan, Business Services  
Dave O'Brien, Physical Plant  
Jim Pettigrew, Radiology  
Greg Rivers, Facilities Planning & Operations  
Dave Stopka, Student Affairs  
Theresa Verneston, College of Education Student Services  
Rick Yost, Chemistry

**Members Absent:**

Barry Ache, Whitney Lab & the Center for Smell & Taste  
Joe Aufmuth, University Libraries  
Jackie Ayers, Student Health  
John Black, Physical Plant  
Michael Bowie, College of Education  
Betha Cato, Health and Human Performance  
Rick Drummond, Dept. of Growth Management  
Norb Dunkel, Housing  
Eleanor Green, Large Animal Clinic Sciences  
Denise Jean-Louis, Student  
Gene Hemp, Mechanical & Aerospace Eng.  
Chip Howard, UAA  
Ama Mathewos, Student

Nancy Mendenhall, Radiology & Oncology  
Tom Saunders, Community Development Dept.  
Rich Segal, Pharmacy Health Care Ad  
Bryan Weber, College of Nursing

**Visitors:**

Erick Lewis, Facilities Planning & Construction  
Robert Hockman, Veterinary Medicine

The University Comprehensive Master Plan 2005-2015 Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) met Thursday, January 27, 2005 at Facilities Planning and Construction Division, 232 Stadium West Conference Room. Linda Dixon, Chair, presided and called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Committee members introduced themselves followed by Linda Dixon, chair welcoming members to the meeting.

**II. Adoption of Agenda**

**Motion:** Joe Little moved to approve the Agenda as presented.

**Second:** Dave Stopka

**Motion carried unanimously**

**III. Adoption of December 6, 2004 Minutes**

**Motion made and seconded to approved the minutes of December 6, 2004 as presented.**

**Motion carried unanimously**

**IV. Setting Extra Meeting Date**

**Motion:** Joe Little made a motion to schedule the extra meeting date for the MPSC meeting on March 10, 2005 from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm.

**Second:** Jean Larson

**Motion carried unanimously**

## **V. Guiding Principles and Evaluation Criteria**

At the December 6, 2004 Master Plan Steering Committee meeting, members discussed and made recommendations to modify a set of Guiding Principles and Evaluation Criteria.

Ms. Linda Dixon presented a copy of the Proposed Guiding Principles reflecting those modifications to the committee for further discussion, comments and approval. Linda stated that the Transportation Study Committee (TSC) reviewed and approved the MPSC recommendation to add a Guiding Principle regarding parking policies. She also indicated that the Conservation Principles are still being discussed by the Conservation Study Committee. Linda suggested that perhaps the MPSC members would like to defer the Conservation Area or approve them conceptually to be refined by the Conservation Study Committee.

Jane Brockman stated that she did not understand what the two new Principles **I** and **J** meant. She asked if Linda would explain the new tools stated in the Principles. Joe Little stated that he agreed with Ms. Brockman. He also felt that these Principles as presented were incomprehensive and could not go in the Plan as written.

Ms. Dixon stated that at the last meeting it was discussed that these Principles are intended to guide the process. They are not necessarily statement of the goals that would ultimately appear in the Plan. However, the goals that would appear in the Plan and the policies and recommendations in the Plan would be consistent with these Principles.

Linda explained that unlike the local government, the Master Plan does not have implementing tools such as zoning, set backs and a host of land development regulations. The next step after the Master Plan is Building Construction Standards and Building Codes. Her thought was, when developing these two new Principles, that the MPSC could develop some tools. For example, some type of overlays for certain parts of campus and different building height and different design standards in the historic area as opposed to the Health Science Center Area.

Mark Hoit suggested changing the wording to say **to be identified together with new guidelines and standards that control the intensity and density of...**

**Motion:** Joe Little made a motion to accept the proposed Guiding Principle (**I**) as amended:

**New Building Locations shall comply with building and site plan criteria, to be developed that will address issues such as intensity and density restrictions, parking requirements, building height, and open space.**

**Second:** Jim Pettigrew

**Motion carried unanimously**

**Motion:** Joe Little made a motion to accept the proposed Guiding Principles (**J**)

as amended:

**New Building Locations shall comply with architectural design and compatibility standards for new buildings to be developed.**

**Second:** Jerry Cutler

**Motion carried unanimously**

Linda asked for a motion to approve the other amended Guiding Principles submitted to the committee for review and approval:

Bruce Delaney asked if the Conservation Study Committee had discussed replicating or restoring any of the natural areas.

Linda stated that restoration is one of the management strategies that the CSC refers to in Item **h** of the Conservation Area Principles. Linda is going to present Bruce's comment to the CSC for further discussion.

**Motion:** Jane Brockman made a motion to postpone the adoption of the Conservation Area Approaches, Section Number 5, until the Conservation Study Committee submits their final recommendations.

**Second:** Dave Stopka

**Motion carried 18 to 1**

Linda indicated that the first four items of the Guiding Principles still needed the committee's recommendations and approval.

**Motion:** Jerry Cutler made a motion to create a new category for over arching Guiding Principles:

**Second:** Rick Yost

**Motion carried unanimously**

Linda directed the committee's attention to the minutes regarding the Vision Statement that they adopted at the last meeting to see if that satisfied the intent of the motion. That is where the comments about sustainability and academics are presented. Committee members discussed the Vision Statement and determined that it did not quite express the idea of an over-arching principle related to sustainability, neighborhoods and intergovernmental relations.

Once again, Ms. Dixon asked for the committee's recommendations and approval of the

Guiding Principles as presented:

**Motion: Joe Little made a motion to accept the Guiding Principles 1-4 as amended:**

**1) New Building Locations shall:**

- a. Avoid identified natural and man-made constraints to the extent feasible;
- b. Provide proximity and density that promote walking, especially between interrelated land uses;
- c. Provide appropriate buffers to non-university properties and conservation areas;
- d. Protect historic buildings, views and context;
- e. Be concentrated in existing or transitioning activity centers rather than in sparse low-density suburban patterns;
- f. Create urban environments with buildings that define important exterior spaces and street fronts;
- g. Protect outdoor teaching and research land resources;
- h. Focus facilities with frequent general-public interaction in accessible locations near the campus perimeter.
- i. Comply with building and site plan criteria, to be developed that will address issues such as intensity and density restrictions, parking requirements, building height, and open space.
- j. Comply with architectural design and compatibility standards for new buildings to be developed.

**2) Future Land Use designations shall:**

- a. Include subclasses of active recreation, passive recreation and academic/research;
- b. Protect natural resources;
- c. Locate compatible and complementary activities in close proximity; and
- d. Separate and/or buffer incompatible activities adequately.

**3) Capital Investments shall:**

- a. Support the Academic Strategic Plan;
- b. Serve demonstrable need;
- c. Consider adaptive reuse/renovation, co-location, and multi-disciplinary approaches;
- d. Consider life-cycle costing;
- e. Consider utility and infrastructure capacities;
- f. Eliminate temporary buildings;
- g. Employ new technologies for teaching, research and service delivery; and
- h. Emphasize maintenance and preservation of existing assets while considering physical plant expansions.

**4) Transportation approaches shall:**

- a. Encourage and safely accommodate non-motorized travel (bicycle and pedestrian);
- b. Locate new facilities with densities and proximities that provide walkability;
- c. Reduce parking and vehicular access in the auto-free zone;
- d. Provide parking in the campus perimeter near developing activity centers with good transit service;

- e. Provide appropriate transit service in the auto-free zone and between activity centers with facilities including shelters and transfer hubs;
- f. Discourage single-occupant vehicle access into and around campus through physical modifications and parking policy such as pricing and vehicle storage;
- g. Modify the campus roadway system to provide safe and adequate access to activity centers and parking facilities with appropriate roadway designs that include traffic calming, intersection modifications and transit-oriented design; and
- h. Address parking policies including pricing and decal programs.

**Second:** Bruce DeLaney

**Motion carried unanimously**

**VI. Eastside Campus Development Concept Plan**

Linda Dixon presented information about the Eastside Campus on Waldo Road that was amended into the campus Master Plan in March 2004. Since that time, additional site analysis has been conducted including development of a utilities distribution plan and master stormwater permit. The Powell Hall Materials and Structures Lab will soon be under construction and Building 1603 is undergoing renovation. Some utility upgrades including water, sanitary sewer and IT are currently being installed. The MPSC was presented with information about the Eastside Campus as it will be a property covered in the 2005-2015 Maser Plan Update.

**VI. Activity Center and Structured Parking Opportunity Sites Analysis**

Linda Dixon presented information about proposed activity centers where future development could be located and structured parking opportunity sites. Maps were presented to show the proximity of these centers and structures based on a five-minute walk distance. These locations were proposed as a result of discussions that took place during the 2003 Vision workshops.

Due to time constraints, this was deferred until a future agenda.

**VIII. Meeting adjourned at 3:05**